



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/363,949	07/29/1999	DUANE KIMBELL FIELDS	AT9-99-201	8760

35525 7590 09/10/2003

DUKE W. YEE  
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.  
P.O. BOX 802334  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

JACOBS, LASHONDA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/363,949

Applicant(s)

FIELDS ET AL.

Examiner

LaShonda T. Jacobs

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

This Office Action is an response to Applicant's Amendment filed on June 20, 2003. Claims 1-18 and 20-29 are presented for further examination. Claim 19 has been cancelled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-18 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Densmore in view of Gosling et al (hereinafter, "Gosling", EP 0810524).

As per claims 1, Densmore discloses a method for extending the capabilities of a web server, comprising the steps of:

- sending a request from a client to the web server, the request identifying requested content and including addresses for a plurality of code module modules needed to service the request (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50);
- receiving the requested content at the web server (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50); and
- applying the installed plurality of code modules sequentially to the requested content (col. 8, lines 62-67, and col. 9, lines 1-4).

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

Art Unit: 2157

- if the given code module is unavailable at the web server, having the web server use a corresponding address to request the given code module from a publishing server; and
- installing the given code module at the web server.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- if the given code module is unavailable at the web server, having the web server use a corresponding address to request the given code module from a publishing server (pg. 3, lines 25-30); and
- installing the given code module at the web server (pg. 3, lines 25-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by requesting a code module from the publishing server if it is unavailable at the web server allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 2, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- the step of serving the given code module from the publishing server to the web server.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- the step of serving the given code module from the publishing server to the web server (pg. 3, lines 25-30).

Art Unit: 2157

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by serving the code module from the publishing server to the web server allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 3, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the corresponding, address is a URL (col. 6, lines 36-50).

As per claim 4, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the given code module is unavailable to the web server because the web server does not support the given code module.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- wherein the given code module is unavailable to the web server because the web server does not support the given code module (pg. 3, lines 25-30, Gosling discloses a servlet object that is not initially on the local server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by requesting a code module from the publishing server if it is unavailable at the web server allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 5, Densmore disclose the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the given code module is unavailable to the web server because the server cannot access the given code module.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- wherein the given code module is unavailable to the web server because the server cannot access the given code module (pg. 3, lines 25-30, Gosling discloses a servlet object that is not initially on the local server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by requesting a code module from the publishing server if it is not accessible at the web server allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 6, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the request includes a unique identifier for each code module within the plurality of code modules (col. 6, lines 35-50, col. 8, lines 62-67, and col. 9, lines 1-4).

As per claim 7, Densmore discloses:

- wherein each code module within the plurality of code modules conforms to a specific transformation API of the web server (col. 1, lines 16-38, col. 6, lines 35-50, col. 8, lines 62-67, and col. 9, lines 1-4).

As per claim 8, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- having the publishing server sign the given code module with a key;
- serving the signed code module from the publishing server to the web server; and
- verifying authenticity of the signed code module prior to the installing step.

Art Unit: 2157

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- having the publishing server sign the given code module with a key (pg. 4, lines 22-31, Gosling discloses that servlets “built into” the server of servlets digitally signed in the Java archives files are trusted and granted more permission by security manager);
- serving the signed code module from the publishing server to the web server (pg. 4, lines 34-40); and
- verifying authenticity of the signed code module prior to the installing step (pg. 4, lines 41-48, Gosling discloses a security operation step that is performed on the servlet to assure there is no security problems associated with the uploaded servlet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by having the publishing serve sign the code module with key, sending the code module to the web server and installing the module allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 9, Densmore discloses a method for enabling a web client to add functionality to a web server on an as-needed basis, comprising the steps of:

- receiving a request from a client, the request identifying a code module required to process the request (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50).

However, Densmore does not explicitly discloses:

- responsive to a determination that the code module is not available at the web server, uploading a code module from the client to the web server; and

Art Unit: 2157

- at the web server, using the uploaded code module as needed to service a given request from the web client.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- responsive to a determination that the code module is not available at the web server, uploading a code module from the client to the web server (pg. 3, lines 25-30); and
- at the web server, using the uploaded code module as needed to service a given request from the web client (pg. 3, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by determining if the code module is unavailable at the web server and uploading the code module to service the request allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 12, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the code module conforms to a given application programming interface (API) (col. 1, lines 16-38).

As per claims 13 and 17, Densmore discloses, a method operative at a web server in a computer network comprising the steps of:

- receiving a request from a client, the request identifying requested content, a plurality of code module modules, and an address for each code module within the plurality of code modules (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50);
- receiving the requested content at the web server (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50); and



Art Unit: 2157

- using the plurality of code modules sequentially to process the requested content to form transformed content (col. 8, lines 62-67, and col. 9, lines 1-4); and
- serving the transformed content back to the client (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50).

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- if a given code module within the plurality of code modules is unavailable at the web server, using a corresponding address to request the given code module from a given location in the computer network;
- installing the given code module at the web server;

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

if a given code module within the plurality of code modules is unavailable at the web server, using a corresponding address to request the given code module from a given location in the computer network (pg. 3, lines 25-30); and

- installing the given code module at the web server (pg. 3, lines 25-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by requesting a code module from the publishing server if it is unavailable at the web server allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 14, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- the step of authenticating the given code module prior to the installing step.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- the step of authenticating the given code module prior to the installing step (pg. 4, lines 41-48, Gosling discloses a security operation step that is performed on the servlet to assure there is no security problems associated with the uploaded servlet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by authenticating the code module prior to installing the module on web server allowing the server to process the user requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 15, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the given location is a publishing server.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- wherein the given location is a publishing server (pg. 4, lines 22-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by specifying the given location as the publishing server allowing the user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 16, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the step of authenticating includes applying a given key to information retrieved from the publishing server.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- wherein the step of authenticating includes applying a given key to information retrieved from the publishing server (pg. 4, lines 22-31, Gosling discloses a digital signature on executable code for accessing network services).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by authenticating the code module prior to installing the module on web server allowing the server to process the user requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 20, Densmore discloses a computer program product in a computer usable medium operative in a web server, comprising:

- means for receiving a request from a client, the request identifying a code module required to process the request (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50).

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- means responsive to a determination that the code module is not available at the web server for requesting the client to upload the code module; and
- means responsive to receipt of the code module from the client for installing the code module at the web server for use in responding to the request.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- means responsive to a determination that the code module is not available at the web server for requesting the client to upload the code module (pg. 3, lines 25-30); and

Art Unit: 2157

- means responsive to receipt of the code module from the client for installing the code module at the web server for use in responding to the request (pg. 3, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by determining if the code module is unavailable at the web server and uploading the code module to service the request allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 22, Densmore discloses:

- means for executing the code module to respond to the request (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50).

As per claim 23, Densmore discloses a web server operative in a computer network, comprising:

- means for receiving a request from a client, the request identifying requested content, a plurality of code modules, and an address for each code module within the plurality of code modules (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50);
- receiving the requested content (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50); and
- means for applying the plurality of code modules sequentially on the requested content to respond to the request (col. 8, lines 62-67, and col. 9, lines 1-4).

Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- means responsive to a determination that a given code module is not available at the web server for using a corresponding address to request the given code module from a given location in the computer network; and
- means responsive to receipt of the given code module from the given location for

installing the given code module at the web server for use in responding to the request.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- means responsive to a determination that a given code module is not available at the web server for using a corresponding address to request the given code module from a given location in the computer network (pg. 3, lines 25-30); and
- means responsive to receipt of the given code module from the given location for
- installing the given code module at the web server for use in responding to the request (pg. 3, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by determining if the code module is unavailable at the web server and uploading the code module to service the request allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim **25**, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the each code module within the plurality of code modules is written to conform to a server API (col. 1, lines 16-38).

As per claim **26**, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the each code module within the plurality of code modules is written in Java (col. 5, lines 23-24).

As per claim **27**, Densmore discloses:

- means for deleting a code module from the server upon a given occurrence (col. 9, lines 1-4).

As per claim 28, Densmore discloses in a client-server computer network, the improvement comprising:

- a web client having means for identifying a plurality of code module modules required to process a client request (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50);
- a web server, comprising:
  1. means responsive; to receipt of a request from the web client for identifying requested content, a plurality of code module modules, and a URL for each code module within the plurality of code modules (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50);
  2. means for receiving the requested content (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50)
  3. means operative during a web transaction for applying the plurality of code modules sequentially to the requested content to respond to the request to form transformed content (col. 8, lines 62-67, and col. 9, lines 1-4); and
  4. means for serving the transformed content back to the web client (col. 4, lines 42-53, and col. 6, lines 36-50).

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- a publishing server supporting the a given code module at a given URL;
  1. means responsive to a determination that a given code module is not available at the web server for using a corresponding URL to request the given code module from the publishing server; and

Art Unit: 2157

2. means responsive to receipt of the given code module from the publishing server for installing the given code module.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- a publishing server supporting the a given code module at a given URL (pg. 3, lines 25-30);
  1. means responsive to a determination that a given code module is not available at the web server for using a corresponding URL to request the given code module from the publishing server (pg. 3, lines 25-30); and
  2. means responsive to receipt of the given code module from the publishing server for installing the given code module. (pg. 3, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by determining if the code module is unavailable at the web server and uploading the code module to service the request allowing a user to receive the requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claims 10 and 29, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the web client is a pervasive computing client (col. 4, lines 59-65).

As per claim 11, Densmore discloses:

- wherein the code module translates data into a given proprietary format and serves the translated data back to the pervasive computing client (col. 6, lines 18-23).

As per claims 18, 21 and 24, Densmore discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

- means for authenticating the given code module.

Art Unit: 2157

However, Densmore does not explicitly disclose:

- means for authenticating the given code module.

Gosling discloses a method and apparatus for operating a local server computer of a client-server network comprising:

- means for authenticating the given code module (pg. 4, lines 16-27, and lines 41-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Densmore and Gosling by authenticating the code module allowing the server to process the user requested content in a timely and efficient manner.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 and 20-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Office notes the following arguments:

(a) Gosling does not teach or suggest a client sending a request that identifies requested content and includes addresses for a plurality of code module modes needed to service the request and the server applying the plurality of code modules sequentially to the requested content, as recited in representative claim, as amended.

(b) The applied prior art fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation; therefore, Gosling does not anticipate claim 1.

(c) Gosling does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention.



Art Unit: 2157

(d) Gosling does not teach or suggest uploading a code module from a client to a server, at the web server, using the uploaded code module to service the request from the client.

(e) Murray teaches that the client may post an object to the server. However, Murray does not teach or suggest, “receiving a request from a client, the client identifying a code module required to process the request”, as recited in claim 9.

(f) The server in Murray does not actually execute the applet in anyway. Therefore, Murray does not teach or suggest, “at the web server, using the uploaded code module as needed to service a given request from the web client,” as recited in claim 9.

(g) Murray does not make up for the deficiencies of Gosling.

(h) The applied reference taken alone or in combination fail to teach each and every claim limitation. Therefore, the combination of Gosling and Murray does not render claim 9 obvious.

(i) Murray does not teach means for deleting a code module from the server, wherein a code module is applied to requested content to perform a client request, as recited in claim 27.

(j) Murray also fails to teach or suggest a client sending a request that identifies requested content and includes addresses for a plurality of code modules needed to service the request and the server applying the plurality of code modules sequentially to the requested content.

Therefore, Murray does not make for the deficiencies of Gosling. The applied reference taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Therefore, claim 27, is not rendered obvious by the combination of Gosling and Murray.

(k) Fields does not make for the deficiencies of Gosling and Murray, as addressed above. As such, the applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and

Art Unit: 2157

every claim limitation and the combination of Gosling, Murray, and Fields does not render claims 10 and 11 obvious.

4. In considering claims (a)-(k), Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaShonda T. Jacobs whose telephone number is 703-305-7494. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

LaShonda T. Jacobs  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

ltj  
September 8, 2003

  
MOUSTAFI M. MEKY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER